

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *

*

vs.

*

Criminal No.: RDB-14-0389

*

ANTOINE WASHINGTON, et al. *

* * * * *

**CONSENT MOTION FOR EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM
SPEEDY TRIAL COMPUTATIONS**

The Defendant, Jermaine Cannady, by and through his attorney, Alan R. L. Bussard, and on behalf of himself, all defendants, and the Government, hereby moves this Honorable Court, as follows:

1. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(c)(1), the speedy trial time on the indictment in this case began to run on September 15, 2014, the day on which the last defendant had his initial appearance in Court.

2. On September 24, 2014, the Court held a scheduling conference call with counsel for all parties. A trial date, motions date (to be set), pretrial conference date(s), and schedule for the filing of motions was agreed upon and memorialized in a Scheduling order (ECF 95).

3. Discovery, including recordings of consensually conducted telephone

conversations and other materials, has been provided to the defense, with more being prepared. Some of the defendants may seek the preparation of pre-plea criminal history reports.

4. The defense counsel will need sufficient time to review the discovery in this case, to discuss the case with their respective clients, to consider plea options, and to prepare pretrial motions. Pursuant to the Scheduling Order, all motions except motions *in limine*, are to be filed no later than November 17, 2014.

5. The agreed upon trial date is March 9, 2015 and estimated to last two (2) weeks.

6. All parties request an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from the date of this Motion through the trial date of March 9, 2015. The circumstances of this case permit such a delay and a continuance of the trial date beyond the normal seventy-day time frame. This case involves multiple defendants charged with an attempted drug trafficking conspiracy following numerous consensually recorded telephone conversations, along with instances of law enforcement surveillance and questioning of at least one known informant. Scheduling of this case has required coordinating the schedules of nine (9) separate defense attorneys. Accordingly, the nature of the case is such that additional time is necessary for discovery, analysis of evidence by defense counsel, preparation of pretrial motions, and plea negotiations.

7. Periods of delay that extend the time within which trial should commence include delay resulting from a continuance of a trial date beyond the seventy day speedy trial day, if such continuance is granted by the Court on the basis of a finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). For the reasons stated above, in this case the ends of justice served by continuing the trial of the matter outweigh the interests of the Defendants, and the public, in a speedy trial, and the resulting delay is permissible pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7).

8. During the aforementioned conference call, undersigned counsel was instructed by the Court to file the instant Motion. None of the parties stated any objection to the entry of this Order.

WHEREFORE, all parties, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby requests that the Court issue an unopposed Order providing for the requested exclusion of time from the date of this Motion through March 9, 2015. A proposed Order is submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Alan R. L. Bussard
101 East Chesapeake Avenue
Ste. 200
Towson, Maryland 21286
410-821-1155